

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to make a number of editorial revisions. A substitute specification and abstract have been prepared and are submitted herewith. No new matter has been added.

Withdrawn claims 4-7, 9, 11, 13-15, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36 and 38 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking an essential feature. Claim 16 has been amended so as to address this rejection. As a result, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In addition, claims 1-3, 10, 12, 16-18, 23, 25, 27, 29, 33, 35 and 37 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions. These revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. None of these amendments have been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, nor to address issues related to patentability and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1-3, 8, 16-18, 23, 29, 31, 33 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Goodman (US 5,402,492). Claims 10 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of McIntyre (US 6,630,928). Claims 12, 27 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Poisner (US 6,108,785). These rejections are respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is patentable over Goodman, since claim 1 recites an information processing system having, in part, a main unit of an information processor, an input means that is detachable from the main unit of the information processor, and a start of password presence checking means, wherein the main unit of the information processor enters a starting mode regardless of whether the startup password presence checking means determines that a startup password is present or absent, if the input means is not connected to the main unit of the information processor. Goodman fails to disclose or suggest the main unit of the information processor recited in claim 1.

Goodman discloses a security system 100 for a computer 110. The security system 100 includes a keyboard controller 120, a non-volatile memory 125, at least one port 130 and a keyboard 135. The keyboard controller 120 controls the operations of the security system 100 and performs a number of pre-programmed procedures which relate to the interaction between the computer 110, the keyboard 135 and the port 130.

The security system 100 implemented by the keyboard controller 120 utilizes both a hardware key 230 and a plurality of passwords to enable access to the computer 110. The security system 100 is divided into two levels of password security, an administrative level and a user level. The hardware key 230 overrides all system security. The user level is accessible by the entry of a first password and the administrative level, which allows for greater access to the computer 110, is accessible by the entry of a second password. Further, the hardware key 230, when connected to the port 130, allows access to the computer at the administrative level.

During operation, the security system 100 is initialized within the keyboard controller 120. Initially, the keyboard controller 120 determines whether or not the hardware key 230 is attached to the port 130 and whether or not a key ID stored in the hardware key 230 matches a key ID stored in the non-volatile memory 125. If the hardware key 230 is present and the key ID contained therein matches the key ID stored in the non-volatile memory 125, the keyboard controller 120 authorizes the computer 110 to be used at the administrative level. If the hardware key 230 is not present or the key ID contained in the hardware key 230 does not match the key ID stored in the non-volatile memory 125, the keyboard controller 120 waits to see if a password is entered via the keyboard 135. If a password is entered via the keyboard 135, the keyboard controller 120 compares the entered password with one or more passwords stored in the non-volatile memory 125 to determine whether the entered password matches either an administrative level password or a user level password stored in the non-volatile memory 125. If the entered password matched either an administrative password or a user password stored in the non-volatile memory 125, the keyboard controller authorizes the computer 110 to operate at a corresponding level. (See column 1, line 46 - column 2, line 59; column 4, line 6 - column 5, line 31; column 9, line 57 - column 10, line 28; and Figure 2).

In the rejection of claim 1, it is indicated that the computer 110 corresponds to the claimed main unit of the information processor and the keyboard 135 corresponds to the claimed input means. Further, the rejection indicates that Goodman discloses that the computer 110

enters a starting mode regardless of whether or not the non-volatile memory 125 contains either an administrative password or a user password if no input signal is detected from the keyboard 135 (i.e., the keyboard 135 is not connected to the computer 110). However, based on the above discussion of Goodman, this is clearly not the case.

While Goodman does disclose that the keyboard controller 120 checks the non-volatile memory 125 to determine whether at least one of a key ID, an administrative password, and a user password have been stored therein, and will enter a subroutine to prompt a user to create and store the key ID, the administrative password, and the user password if they are not previously stored in the non-volatile memory 125, there is no disclosure or suggestion anywhere in Goodman that if the keyboard controller 120 does not detect the presence of the keyboard 135, the keyboard controller 120 will allow the computer 110 to startup regardless of whether or not the key ID, the administrative password, and the user password are stored in the non-volatile memory 125. In other words, the keyboard controller 120 is not disclosed or suggested as performing a decision regarding the startup of the computer 110 based on the presence or absence of the keyboard 135.

Regarding Figure 9 of Goodman, which is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing a number of the features of the claimed invention, it is noted that this figure illustrates the subroutine executed by the keyboard controller 120 to prompt the user to set the administrative password and/or the user password to be stored in the non-volatile memory 125. Further, it is noted that none of the decision steps in this subroutine disclose or suggest that a determination regarding the startup of the computer 110 is based on whether or not the keyboard 135 is connected to the keyboard controller 120. Therefore, there is nothing in this subroutine that discloses or suggests the above-discussed feature of claim 1. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Goodman.

As for McIntyre and Poisner, they are relied upon in the rejections as disclosing a touch panel and voice generation means, respectively. However, it is apparent that neither of these references discloses or suggests the above-discussed feature of claim 1.

As for claim 16, it is patentable over the references relied upon in the rejections for reasons similar to those discussed above in support of claim 1. That is, claim 16, like claim 1, recites, in part, entering the main unit of the information processor into a startup mode regardless of whether the startup password is detected as being present or absent, if the input means is not

connected to the main unit of the information processor, which feature is not disclose or suggested by the references.


Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35 and 37 are allowable over the references relied upon the rejections. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35 and 37. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35 and 37 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Takashi KOBAYASHI

By:



David M. Ovedovitz
Registration No. 45,336
Attorney for Applicant

DMO/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 12, 2005